

Take up the sword and rifle,  
 Still keep your conscience whole—  
 So soon is found an unction [remedy]  
 'To soothe a guilty soul.  
 Go with it to your Maker,  
 Find what excuse ye can—  
 Rob for the sake of justice,  
 Kill for the love of man.

\* \* \* \*

We've taken up the white man's burden  
 Of ebony and brown;  
 Now will you tell us, Rudyard,  
 How we may put it down?

### READING REVIEW

1. What was Kipling's attitude toward the conquered people?
2. (a) What was the point of the first poem that imitated the Kipling poem? (b) of the second? (c) of the last, four-line poem?
3. Cite two examples from the poems which satirized the white man's reasons for continuing to follow an expansionist policy.

## 185 From The Hawaiian Viewpoint

By the late 1800's Americans owned most of the sugar plantations in Hawaii and had obtained a treaty that allowed Hawaiian sugar to enter the United States duty free. However, the McKinley Tariff Act of 1890 threatened the Hawaiian sugar planters by allowing all foreign sugar to enter the United States duty free and by giving a two-cent per pound subsidy to American sugar producers. Shortly afterward the planters asked that Hawaii be annexed by the United States, believing this was the only way to save their sugar industry.

Queen Liliuokalani, who was supported by the Hawaiian people, opposed annexation. And in 1893, because of her efforts against them, the planters and other Americans in Hawaii revolted against her rule and set up their own government. In this selection, the queen told what happened in Hawaii before the annexation.

### READING FOCUS

1. Why did the Hawaiians allow Americans to take over their government?
2. What actions of the United States did Queen Liliuokalani criticize?

It has been said that the Hawaiian people under the rule of the chiefs were harshly ruled. Under the monarchy, it was held, their condition greatly improved, but the native government in any form finally became intolerable to the better informed part of the community. I shall not examine such statements in detail. But I do feel called upon to make a few remarks from my own—that is to say, the native Hawaiian—viewpoint.

I shall not claim that in the days of Captain Cook our people were civilized. I shall not claim anything more for their progress in civilization and Christian morality than missionary writers have. Perhaps I may safely claim even less, admitting the criticism of some intelligent visitors who were not missionaries. In other words, the habits and prejudices of New England Puritanism were not well adapted to a tropical people, and could not be thoroughly absorbed by them.

But they have accepted Christianity in substance. I know of no people who have developed a tenderer Christian conscience, or who have shown themselves more ready to obey its commands. And where else in the world's history have savage people, pagan for ages, with fixed customs and beliefs, made equal progress in civilization and Christianity in the same amount of time?

Does it say nothing for us that we have always recognized our Christian teachers as worthy of authority in our councils? That while four fifths of the population of our islands were killed by diseases introduced by foreigners, the ruling class held on to Christian morality, and gave its strong support and service to the work of saving and civilizing the masses? Has not this class loyally held on to the brotherly alliance made with the better group of foreign settlers, giving freely of its authority and its substance, its sons and daughters, to cement and prosper it?

Why should it be thought strange that education and knowledge of the world have made us able to see that as a race we have some special mental and physical requirements not shared by other races? That certain habits and ways of living are better for our health and happiness than others? And that a separate nationality and a particular form of govern-

*Adapted from Hawaii's Story by Hawaii's Queen by Liliuokalani.*



*Americans owned the first large sugar plantations in Hawaii.*

ment, as well as special laws, are, at least for the present, best for us? These things were ours until the pitiless and tireless "annexation policy" was effectively backed by the naval power of the United States.

Before this we had allowed foreigners to give us a constitution and control the offices of government. Not without protest, indeed, for this grabbing of power caused us much humiliation and distress. But we did not resist it by force. It had not entered our hearts to believe that these friends and allies from the United States would ever go so far as to overthrow our form of government, grab our nation by the throat, and turn it over to a foreign power.

Perhaps there is a kind of right, known as the "Right of Conquest," under which robbers may take whatever they are strong enough to grab from others. I will not pretend to decide how far civilization and Christian teachings have outlawed this right.

If we have been friendly to those who sought our ruin, it was because they were Americans, like those whom we believed to be our dearest friends and allies. If we did not resist their final outrage by force, it was because we could not do so without striking at the military might of the United States. The conspirators, having actually gained possession of the government, refused to give up their conquest. So it happens that the people of the islands have no voice in determining their future, but are in a condition like that of the American Indians.

It is not for me to consider this matter from the American point of view. The current ques-

tion of annexation, however, involves a departure from the established policy of that country and a dangerous change in its foreign relations. I am able to say, with absolute authority, that the native people of Hawaii are entirely loyal to their own chiefs, and are deeply attached to their own customs and government. They either do not understand, or bitterly oppose, the scheme of annexation.

Perhaps I may say here a final word about the Americans who favor this annexation of Hawaii. I observe that it is pretty much a party matter, favored chiefly by Republican leaders and politicians. But is it really a matter of party interest? Is the American Republic to decline and become a colonizer and a land-grabber? And is this prospect acceptable to a people who depend upon self-government for their liberties? There is little question but that the United States could become a successful rival of the European nations in the race for conquest and could create a great military and naval power if such is its ambition. But is such an ambition praiseworthy? Is such a departure from established principles patriotic or wise?

## READING REVIEW

1. According to Queen Liliuokalani, why did the Hawaiians let the Americans take control of their government?
2. For what actions did Queen Liliuokalani criticize the Americans?
3. (a) What special interests did some Americans have in the Hawaiian islands? (b) How did this affect the United States policy with regard to establishing a new government for Hawaii?